



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JANUARY, 1908

SOME NEW CONSIDERATIONS TOWARDS THE DATING OF THE BOOK OF MALACHI.

THE Book of Malachi is commonly assigned to various periods of the career of Ezra or Nehemiah¹. The latest date which has been proposed is by Torrey², who attributes it to the first half of the fourth century B. C.

The conditions described, religious and social, the perversion of religion by the priests and the utter demoralization of the people (ii. 8, iii. 5) have clearly a resemblance to the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the reference to the *פִּזְחָה* (i. 8) may be regarded as further indication that the book may belong to the Persian period. Malachi, however, describes also another class of persons, in his eyes not less worthy of censure than the gross offenders against the law of Yahweh (ii. 17, iii. 13 ff.), whom we should perhaps rather designate as honest freethinkers; and a difficulty, which complicates the question of date—not yet

¹ Among those who hold that the work belongs to a time shortly before the arrival of Ezra at Jerusalem, are Herzfeld, Bleek, Reuss, Stade, and Nowack, while Köhler, Nägelsbach, Schrader, Keil, v. Orelli, Kuenen, and Steiner refer it to the period of the second visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, or a little earlier. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 357, places it in the time of Nehemiah's absence at the Persian Court.

² *Encyclopedia Biblica*, art. "Malachi."

satisfactorily solved—occurs in the remarkable passage (i. 2-5) in which Edom is represented as the arch-enemy of Israel.

The Book of Malachi is peculiar in its diction and the didactic presentation of its message. Its author was a man eclectic in his use of the Hebrew language, at a period when it was deteriorating under the increasing use of Aramaic. It may be observed, that among literary nations it is precisely at times of its decadence that men of learning and patriotism are at most pains to do honour to their own language and to maintain its original purity by the careful avoidance of foreign elements.

The absence of Aramaisms cannot be regarded as—necessarily—an argument in favour of the early date of the composition of this book, especially in view of the suggestion which has been made that the writer was not, like Isaiah, a preacher to those who could be reached only in popular language, but who rather addressed himself to the few who would appreciate the use of the sacred tongue now fast disappearing.

We may observe that the writer shows familiarity with D, as, for example, in his use of the phrase בני הלי for *priests* and of הרב as the name of the place of the giving of the Law, and also of the deuteronomic phrase חקים ומשפטים.

It has been argued, upon a wrong interpretation of ii. 14 that the Book of Malachi could not have been written before the proclamation of the Law, which did not occur, as we may gather from a comparison of Ezra ix with Neh. ix. 2, until after the dissolution of the mixed marriages, which took place in the second year of Ezra, c. 430 B.C.¹ However, the writer has a purpose entirely different from that of Ezra, and the passage ii. 14 does not refer merely to literal marriage conditions, but to the idea which is involved, that of the acceptance of the religion of Yahweh. The following passage (ii. 15 sq.) may, however, be taken as a literal

¹ Cf. Bertholet in *Marti's Hand-Commentar*, p. xviii.

reference to social conditions, opposed to the moral conception of the writer who, as the prophet of Yahweh, forcibly condemns them, ver. 16. It is indeed conceivable that the passage may be a protest against the severity of Ezra rather than evidence of the author's ignorance of his procedure, a procedure which could hardly have been ignored, had it already taken place. In this light we may perhaps accept the work as later than the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The occurrence of the word פָּחַה (i. 8) has, by some, been regarded as positive evidence that the work belongs to the Persian period. That the P document was known to the author is evident from the stress which he lays upon sacrificial worship. D, as we have seen, was also known to him, and we may assume acquaintance with Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah from his use of the phrase פָּנֵה דֶרֶךְ, *to prepare the way*, which occurs nowhere but in Mal. iii. 1 and in Isa. xl. 3, lvii. 14, lxii. 10, and yet we would not argue from familiarity with these authors that the writer belongs to any of the periods to which they are individually assigned. On the same analogy, are we justified in supposing that the use of the word פָּחַה is necessarily evidence that the book, as commonly alleged, belongs to the Persian period?

The term פָּחַה is used in the Old Testament, from the time of Solomon downward, to indicate various officials, at least by the redactor in 1 Kings x. 15 and 2 Chron. ix. 14. The LXX, however, distinguishes among these officials by the use of various Greek titles, as is shown by the following list:—

פָּחַה =

σατράπης 1 Kings x. 15; 2 Chron. ix. 14, Solomon's governors; 1 Kings xx. 24, Benhadad's captains.

τοπάρχης 2 Kings xviii. 24; Isa. xxxvi. 9, Assyrian captains.

ἡγεμόν Jer. li. 23, 57 (LXX, xxviii. 23, 57), Chaldean governors; Ezek. xxiii. 23, governors of various peoples.

- ἄρχων Neh. iii. 7, v. 14, xii. 26, officials over a district;
 Esther iii. 12, viii. 9, ix. 3, Persian governors.
- ἡγούμενος Mal. i. 8; Jer. li. 28 (LXX, xxviii. 28), governor
 of the Medes; Ezek. xxiii. 6, 12, Assyrian
 governor.
- ἐπαρχος Ezra v. 3, 6, vi. 6, 13, viii. 36; Neh. ii. 7, 9,
 Aramaic form.

With the exception of ἐπαρχος and ἡγεμών the Hebrew title מן is also rendered by these terms.

According to our present sources, there were Governors in Judaea for a short time only, none indeed later than Nehemiah, who in the MT. is called פחה and in the LXX ἄρχων. It would seem from our records that the Persian influence had been but little exerted in relation to the internal affairs of Judaea: cf. Ezra x. 14. We find that the people were governed by twelve *heads* (Ezra ii. 2; Neh. vii. 7) and by *princes* (Neh. xi. 1), but no appointment of any governor is mentioned after Nehemiah, although there must have been a responsible official. That a Jew should have been advanced to such a position seems extraordinary, and it is possible that Nehemiah had the foresight to give such a guarantee to the Persians as induced them to leave this little religious state unmolested, so long as there was a prompt delivery of the taxes. During the Greek period Jerusalem was under the *gerusia*, i. e. the Council of the Elders¹, at the head of which was the high-priest. The power of the high-priest was certainly supreme not only in religious matters, but, as occupying a position as mediator between the people and their rulers, the Greeks, political also, the union of that of Ezra with that of Nehemiah, a sort of priestly governor.

As we have seen, the word פחה in the MT. is applied to various officials; never, however, to priests. A curious instance of the use of the word has been preserved in

¹ Jos., *Ant.* xii. 3. 3.

Bikkurim, III, 3¹ where the plural פחות is used in connexion with סגנים and נזכרים, denoting priests belonging to the highest order. We often find סגנים and פחות used together in the MT.: cf. Jer. li. 23, 28, 57; Ezek. xxiii. 6, 12, 23, where פחות is translated by the LXX by ἡγεμόνας and סגנים by στρατηγούς (or ἡγουμένους καὶ στρατηγούς); to this phrase corresponds οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοί (Luke xxii. 4, 52)². The ἀρχιερεῖς were high-priests who retained the title after they had been deposed from office. Now, if the title פחה had been gradually changed from being the designation of an Assyrian or Persian governor to that (in the plural) of the deposed high-priests of the time of Christ, may we not justly infer that the פחה *par excellence* meant the *ruling* high-priest? From this we may assume that the פחה in Mal. i. 8 does not necessarily refer to a Persian satrap, but rather to some person who, at a time when there was no actual Persian governor in Jerusalem occupied his position and took his title? Who, then, may have been this governor-priest?

Before answering this question it is necessary to find what internal evidence the book affords us for a *terminus a quo* for its possible date. Such evidence is fourfold.

1. Evidence from language.
2. Evidence from the position accorded to the priests.
3. Evidence from the theological view taken by the author.
4. Evidence from his eschatology.

i. As we have seen, the author uses many terms which do not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, and derives his technical expressions from D. The following words occur only here and in P:—

- ii. 2 פֶּרֶשׁ *faecal matter*, Exod. xxix. 14; Lev. iv. 11, viii. 17, xvi. 27; Num. xix. 5.

¹ Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte*, &c., II³, p. 266.

² Schürer, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*

- ii. 15 *חַיָּה*, in the sense of *life*, Gen. vi. 17, vii. 15, 22; also Ezek. xxxvii. 5 et al.; Eccles. iii. 19.

The evidence would so far seem to point to a date not earlier than P. It must be conceded, however, that the elements of P were more or less known before the final codification.

Other words, however, point to a date even later than P.

We find that the writer uses words which occur elsewhere only (1) in Trito-Isaiah and other late passages:—

- i. 7, 12 *נָאֵל* *defile*, Isa. lix. 3, lxiii. 3; Lam. iv. 14; Dan. i. 8.

The part. used as subst. occurs in Zeph. iii. 1.

- i. 12 *פֵּרִי* *fruit*, Isa. lvii. 19.

The verb occurs only in Zech. ix. 17; Ps. lxii. 11, xcii. 15; Prov. x. 31.

- iii. 19 *קִשִּׁי* *stubble*, in a metaphorical sense, Isa. xxxiii. 11; Obad. v. 18.

We may also consider here the words which occur only in Malachi and Deut.- and Trito-Isaiah¹.

- ii. 17 *יָגַע* *to weary*, occurs in the Hiph. only here and Isa. xliii. 23, 24.

- iii. 1 *פָּנֵה-דֶּרֶךְ* *to prepare the way*, Isa. xl. 3, lvii. 14, lxii. 10.

(2) In the Psalms and Wisdom Literature:—

- i. 4 *גִּבּוֹל* *territory*, in a figurative sense, occurs elsewhere only in Job xxxviii. 20, Ps. lxxviii. 54.

- i. 7 *נָאֵל* *to defile*, Pual. only here and Ezra ii. 62 || Neh. vii. 64.

- i. 10, 13 *רָצָה* *to be pleased with, accept*, c. acc. of sacrifice.

The following references may be regarded as containing words and phrases, peculiar to the writer:—

¹ It is a well-known fact that Trito-Isaiah writes on the whole in the same metre as Deut.-Isaiah with whom he also agrees in many things. The idea, therefore, that these two books are the work of one man, namely, Trito-Isaiah, yet written at different periods of his life, is well worth considering.

- i. 2 אהב *to love*, used in the first person by Yahweh (cf. Prov. iii. 12; Deut. vii. 8, 13).
- i. 4 רשע *to be beaten down*, Pual. (only other passage Jer. v. 17 Pō'ēl).
 גבול רשעה *territory of wickedness*: cf. Job xxxviii. 20 and Ps. lxxviii. 54.
- i. 13 נפח *to sniff at*.
 גויל *that which has been rescued after seizure, hence, mutilated*¹.
- i. 14 נוכל *deceiver*.
- ii. 5 והשלום *life and peace*: cf. Prov. iii. 2.
- ii. 6 חורת אמת *faithful instruction*: cf. Neh. ix. 13; Ps. cxix. 1, 2.
- ii. 13 אין followed by the Infinitive.
- iii. 10 טרף *food* in Yahweh's house.
 ארבות השמים *sluices of heaven*, as a figure of blessing.
- iii. 12 חפץ ארץ *land of delight*.
- iii. 16 ספר זכרון *book of remembrance*.

Compare also:—

- ii. 2, iii. 9 מִאֲרָה *curse*, Prov. iii. 33, xxviii. 27, and Deut. xxviii. 20.
- ii. 3 חג *festive sacrifice*, Ps. cxviii. 27.
- ii. 9 נִשָּׂא פָנַי *to show partiality*, Job xiii. 8, 10, xxxiv. 19; Prov. xviii. 5; Ps. lxxxii. 2; Deut. x. 17; Lev. xix. 15 ff. Cf. also Job xxxii. 21; Prov. vi. 35.
- ii. 13 אָנָה *groaning*, Ps. xii. 6, lxxix. 11, cii. 21.
- iii. 6 בְּנִי־יַעֲקֹב as a form of address only here and Ps. cv. 6: cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 13.
- iii. 10 טרף *food*; this idea is late and occurs elsewhere only in Ps. cxi. 5; Prov. xxxi. 15: cf. Job xxiv. 5. The word is old in its primary meaning of *prey*, literal or metaphorical.

¹ Cf. Prof. F. Brown in the *New Hebr. Lex.*

iii. 17 סְגֻלָּה *possession*, Ps. cxxxv. 4.

iii. 20 שֶׁמֶשׁ צִדְקָה *sun of righteousness*, Ps. li. 18, cxix. 108, and Deut. xxxiii. 11.

With the possible exception of two or three passages, all here cited belong to a very late date, many of the Psalms to a late Greek and even Maccabean period. The diction of the book would therefore seem to point to a date long subsequent to that of Ezra and Nehemiah, and, as we shall see, there are certain indications which may suggest a time not far removed from the Maccabean, if not the Maccabean period itself.

2. *The importance of the priesthood.* This can be explained only as a result of the new organization of the cult *personel* set forth in the P code. The reference to the tithes payable to the priests, iii. 8, points to a time after the public introduction of the P code by Ezra and Nehemiah, for, according to Deut. xiv. 22, 29, the tithes were to be paid every third year to the Levites, while according to Num. xviii. 21 ff. P requires that payment be made to the priests.

3. *The theological view taken by the writer.*

The conception of God in Malachi is pre-eminently that of Yahweh, the father and creator of the *individual* Jew, ii. 10. The Jews, therefore, are his בָּנִים and, as such, are brethren.

Yahweh's power is not limited to the land of Israel, but extends far beyond it, i. 5; his name is great among the peoples, i. 14; and everywhere pure sacrifices are brought to him, i. 11. It is his universal rule which Malachi expresses.

The conception of Yahweh as "Father" is not an old one. In Exod. iv. 22 JE; Hos. xi. 1, Israel is called "Son," but Yahweh is not spoken of as "Father." In the few references which exist as to this fatherhood, we can trace a gradual broadening of the idea. In Deut. xxxii. 6 Yahweh is called "the father of Israel" because, by the redemption from Egypt he called Israel into being as

a nation (cf. Exod. iv. 22; Hos. xi. 1), and afterwards watched over them with the tenderness of a parent, Exod. xix. 4 JE; Deut. xxxii. 11. This idea of the sonship of Israel includes that of obligation toward Yahweh as father, i. e. owner and master of his people. Cf. 2 Kings xvi. 2: "Thy servant and thy son am I." The same idea is expressed in Jer. xxxi. 9, 20, according to which Yahweh is the creator of his people.

"My Father," as used in Jer. iii. 4, 19, is an "honourable form of address" which does not necessarily express any spiritual relationship, yet here for the first time Israel is desired to give that name to Yahweh.

A still more developed conception appears in Isa. lxiii. 16, where Yahweh is contrasted with the patriarchs, the physical fathers of Israel. Yahweh is often declared to be the one by whom Israel was created and formed: cf. Isa. xliii. 1, xlv. 2, 24, xlv. 11, xlix. 5, &c., yet he has never been regarded by Israel as their ἀρχηγέτης, but as having elected them through their fathers: cf. e. g. Deut. vii. 8, ix. 5, x. 15. Such fatherhood as is here contrasted must mean something other than that of Deut. xxxii. 6, and I cannot but think that the reference in Isa. lxiii. 16 is rather to an ethical conception of fatherhood than to that of mere ownership as in Deut. xxxii. 6. Yahweh redeemed the Israelites, and therefore, according to oriental thought, owns them, and is their father. Here, however, such an idea is secondary, while the primary reference is to the characteristics of a father, the beginnings of the spiritual conception of the fatherhood of Yahweh. This, however, remains as yet the relation to the people as a whole, and not to the individual. In Malachi, on the other hand, Yahweh is regarded as the father of the individual Israelite (ii. 10), and the inference follows that all Israelites are brethren. Ezra's policy was, if anything, opposed to this teaching of a divine fatherhood, even to such as is presented in the first chapter of Genesis ¹.

¹ Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, p. 60.

This conception of the fatherhood of Yahweh as universal, and not merely Jewish, is confined to Malachi and is very late. His monotheism and conception of Yahweh transcends that of the earlier prophets, and in its general character is analogous to that presented in the Book of Jonah, which, however, it surpasses in this respect.

While the older writers present the *mal'ak Yahweh* as the form under which Yahweh appeared to man, the writer of the Book of Malachi mentions the two as separate beings, iii. 1. He speaks also, for the first time, of a *mal'ak berith* by which we may perhaps understand the protecting angel of the congregation¹. It seems that two angels with separate functions are here mentioned. The *mal'ak Yahweh* as a particular angel occurs first in Zech. i. 11 f., the *mal'ak berith*, the forerunner of Yahweh², only in Malachi. The mention of two special angels who were carrying out the plans of Yahweh points to a time when angels so employed played a prominent part in theology. The incipient stages of this new theology, due in part to a more transcendental conception of the deity, may be found in Zech. i. 12; Job v. 1, xxxiii. 23; Eccles. v. 5, where it is intimated that angels intercede for mankind; in the Book of Daniel, iii. 28, as well as often in the Psalms, they are represented as helpers of mankind. The standard literature on Jewish angelology, however, is that of the apocryphal and New Testament writings; as for example,

¹ Cf. Kraetzschmar, *Die Bundesvorstellung im A. T.*, pp. 237 ff.; Nowack, *Handkommentar*, in loco.

² The interpretation of the *mal'ak berith*, iii. 1, as Elijah in iii. 23 sq. may be due to a misunderstanding of Deut. xviii. 15 sqq., a passage which does not refer to the Messiah. As the *mal'ak berith* is the forerunner of Yahweh, and not of the Messiah, the expected Messiah, according to these verses, iii. 1 and 23 sq., if genuine, must be Elijah—a conception which we find expressed in Jes. Sirach xlvi. 4, 10–11. In the New Testament, Matt. xi. 10–14, Mark i. 2, John i. 21, &c., Elijah is the forerunner of the Messiah: cf. especially Luke i. 17. Cf. also Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, p. 219 sq., 1903.

Enoch liii. 3, lxi. 1, lxii. 11, lxiii. 1, &c.; Bel and the Dragon 34-39; Heb. i. 14; Rev. vi. sq., &c. Any such specific references as we find in Malachi must, therefore, belong to a late period, a time when angelology was a recognized feature in Jewish theological thought.

4. *The eschatology of the writer.* Contrary to Haggai (ii. 5 sqq., 21 sqq.) and Zechariah (i. 15, ii. 1 sqq., vi. 1 sqq.), who expect a severe judgment of Yahweh upon the heathen, the writer of Malachi declares, ii. 17 sqq., iii. 1, 13 sqq., that it is the Jews whom he will severely chastise. How is so great a change of opinion to be historically accounted for? It would indeed be impossible if we assume the writer to have lived in the middle of the fifth century. Haggai and Zechariah were suffering, not only from the public disasters which had fallen upon the Jews in 586 B.C., but from the vicious personal attacks of their neighbours. If we assume, from the above arguments, linguistic and theological, that the writer of the Book of Malachi belonged to a period later than Ezra and Nehemiah, things in his time had greatly changed. So far as the Jews were concerned times were fairly peaceful, although the great nations outside were engaged in mutual strife. Malachi had therefore no ground for calling down the vengeance of Yahweh upon the heathen, he had no dreams of a Jewish world-empire; the desire of his heart was for a spiritual and universal dominion of Yahweh, and to this he gives expression when he declares that Yahweh's name was great among the peoples, i. 5, 11, which could not be said in regard to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, i. 12; therefore, if any punishment were to fall, it was solely upon the Jews. This teaching, so completely opposed to that of Haggai and Zechariah, could be due only to extraordinary conditions among the Jewish community, such as may indeed have existed in the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, but did certainly exist, as we shall see, at a later period.

We have thus seen that the evidences of language, theology, and eschatology point to a time later than Ezra

and Nehemiah, and that the theology finds its counterpart in the Book of Jonah.

But the book affords still other evidences of a date later than that of Ezra-Nehemiah.

In ii. 1 sq. the priests, the givers of the Torah, are said to be upon the verge of themselves forgetting it. This allegation, taken in conjunction with the phrase בְּנִי־לִי, iii. 3, has been considered as sufficient evidence of the period of Ezra as that of the authorship, for we find that the degeneracy of the priesthood is one of the evils of his time, and it is asserted that, had the writer lived after the publication of P, he would have referred to the priests as בְּנֵי צֶרֶק. This seems *a priori* probable, but an investigation of the actual circumstances may perhaps lead us to another conclusion.

We may observe that, throughout the book, a sharp contrast is drawn between the conduct of the priests and that of the Levites: cf. ii. 1, 8 with ii. 4 sqq. While the priests are accused of having led the people astray by false teaching, and of having broken the covenant with Levi¹, the Levites, on the contrary, so long as they were in power, ii. 4 sqq., had been well-pleasing to Yahweh, ii. 6, as having led the people in the right path². This division of priests and Levites did not exist in Deuteronomy: cf. x. 8, xviii. 7; nor even in the time of Ezekiel, cf. xl. 45 with xlv. 10 sq., 14, xlv. 5; and was first formally established by Ezra: cf. the lists, Ezra ii || Neh. vii; 1 Esdras v, although, according to Ezek. xlv. 5 sq., especially ver. 10 sqq., the Levites, who had sacrificed before the local shrines, were to be punished by exclusion from proper priestly functions in the new Temple. Though the Levites were well provided for in P as recipients of tithes, of which they in turn had

¹ Levi is here the name for the priestly tribe as in D, not for the individual.

² The identification of priests with Levites (cf. ii. 6 with iii. 3) is due to a correction in iii. 3, where we must read כֹּהֲנִים *priests*; for the writer always contrasts the priests of his time with the Levites who officiated in former times.

to give a portion to the priests, Num. xviii. 21 sqq., is it likely that they would submit without opposition to new conditions which were actual degradation? We have, however, no evidence beyond that of human analogy for such opposition, none is recorded in Ezra and Nehemiah. May we not, however, suppose that the Book of Malachi points to some such opposition on the part of the Levites, though it be only that of the weak against the strong? May we not regard it as a *Tendenzschrift* pointing out how much more pleasure Yahweh had taken in the service of the old Levites than in that of the new order of priests, who were not only evil in themselves, but exerted a demoralizing influence over the people, ii. 8, in contrast to their predecessors, whose conduct and example were alike upright, ii. 6?

We can hardly assume that a man of so strong a personality as that of Nehemiah would have entirely ignored teaching and ideas so utterly at variance with his own, had this book appeared but a short time, comparatively, before his return to Jerusalem. On the other hand, we may see many reasons for disregard of the priest-code on the part of the author of the Book of Malachi; that he knew it is shown by several references, especially by unmistakable allusion to the existence of a priestly guild, the creation of Ezra, and to its points of difference from the conditions of the earlier Levites, cf. ii. 1, 8 with ii. 4 sqq., &c. The writer may even have himself belonged to one of the older families which had been deposed. If we accept, therefore, this distinction as made by the author, we must assign the Book of Malachi to a period after the publication of P and of the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Another protest which the writer raises against the teaching of Ezra¹ is that as to divorce, ii. 16. This, he declares, is hated by Yahweh, whereas, according to Ezra's presentation, ix. 2, he demanded it as essential to the

¹ Cf. Ezra ix. 2, x. 3, 16-44; Neh. x. 30, 32 sqq., xiii. 4 sqq., 15 sqq., 23 sqq., 28 sqq.

preservation of the purity of the Jewish people. Malachi's point of view was that Yahweh, being in honour among the nations, and receiving from them pure sacrifice, i. 11, 14—a conception contrary to that of Ezra—a marriage, even between a Jew and a non-Jew, was nevertheless productive of holy seed, ורע אלהים, ii. 15. Only in this light can we understand Mal. ii. 15, which should, perhaps, follow ver. 16. The passage ii. 14 should be taken as setting forth that a marriage entered into by a Jew is always sacred, Yahweh himself being the witness, because the woman, whoever she may be, enters into the man's covenant, and stands to the religion of Yahweh in the same relation as that of a wife to her husband, just as that of the man to his religion, is that of a husband to a wife: cf. ii. 11. The woman's attitude towards Yahweh is thus precisely that of her husband who is already a believer. The nobility of soul of the writer thus appears in a new light, he condemns divorce, not only because he regards the grounds given by Ezra as inadequate, but because he accords to the wife of a Jew, be she whom she may, a religious position equal to that of her husband, an idea wholly new among Old Testament prophets, until we come to that turning-point in the religious history of mankind ushered in by Paul: *ἡγιάσται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγιάσται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ*, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

This view receives additional support if taken in connexion with the statement in i. 11, where the prophet speaks of a universal worship of Yahweh.

The meaning of ii. 13–16 has been understood as depicting the same relation of Yahweh to his people as is so touchingly set forth by Hosea; but this is not the case. The writer is condemning, upon religious grounds, a great social evil, originating, in great degree, in the inferior position accorded to the woman in the cult, an evil which must cease if the man has been wedded to Yahwism as to a bride, ii. 11, and the woman also as to a husband, ii. 14,

by means of her relation to the man. It is this decay of all nobler impulse in the people, culminating, as it did, in divorce upon frivolous pretexts, ii. 13 sq., and exhibiting itself in the oppression of the widow and the orphan, in sorcery, perjury, and adultery, iii. 5, which the prophet declares to be the reason of Yahweh's rejection of their sacrifices, ii. 13.

As we have seen, the indignation of the writer against the principle of divorce may be, moreover, a special protest against that procedure on the part of Ezra which served perhaps as a convenient precedent to many of a later generation, and may have been used to conceal, under a semblance of propriety and a shadow of justification, such immoral conduct as we read of in later times¹.

We now return to our question, To what date are we to assign the Book of Malachi, a date which must be subsequent to that of Ezra-Nehemiah if we accept the above arguments drawn from internal evidence?

The key to the date is furnished by the reference in Mal. i. 4, which has caused so much difficulty to commentators.

We have seen that the writer holds to the historical position of the Levites as priests, but that he differs in regard to the Edomites from D², who calls them the brothers of Israel, whose rights, as to land, should be respected, whereas our present author condemns them unconditionally. The exilic and post-exilic prophets also denounced them, and foretold a visitation by Yahweh in punishment for their impious deeds³. We find that, as

¹ Jes. Sirach vii. 26, xxv. 25 : cf. also Matt. v. 32.

² Cf. Deut. ii. 5-8, xxiii. 7.

³ Jer. xlix; Ezek. xxv. 12-14, xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 5; Obad. vv. 1-14; Lam. iv. 21; Isa. xxxiv. 5 sqq., lxiii. 1-4; Ps. lx. 8, lxxxiii. 6-9, cviii. 9, cxxxvii. 7.

Duhm considers Ps. cxxxvii—on account of ver. 8—as belonging to a time shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, but it may be equally considered as reflecting the renewed humiliation of Jerusalem by Artaxerxes Ochus and the rejoicing and aggression of the Edomites, partly from

early as the year 312 B.C. Southern Judaea was in the hands of the Edomites, and was known as Idumea¹, and that in the second century Hebron² was an Idumean town. Between the denunciations of Ezekiel and those of our prophet there is a long silence in regard to Edom. The memoirs of Ezra-Nehemiah make no reference to the Idumeans, but later we hear of them frequently, especially in the later Psalms. The wrath of the Jews must have received increased occasion by renewed encroachment upon their territory, which can have occurred only at some period of national disaster, and not in the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, when the Jews enjoyed the protection of the powerful Persian empire, and when an incursion into Judaea would have been severely visited upon the offenders.

We know that the Jews joined in an unsuccessful revolt against Artaxerxes Ochus³, who led many of them captive to Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea, about 350 B.C. The Jews, in consequence, fell into disgrace, and being helpless had probably to suffer from the renewed attacks of their old enemies the Edomites, who in turn had been pressed forward by the Nabateans⁴, and were compelled to seize

mere self-preservation, though not so regarded by the Jews, and partly by the desire to retaliate upon the Jews for former enmities. To the Persian Empire, as the heir of the Assyrian world, would naturally be transferred all the hatred against Babylon which the Jews had long stored up, cf. Isa. x. 16, 23; so that, in the phraseology of Ps. cxxxvii. 8, we may look for a recollection of the ignominy which they had suffered at the hands of the Babylonian kings, and which they were in some degree still suffering from their heir and successor Artaxerxes Ochus. The kindness of his predecessors had long been forgotten. The other Psalms belong undoubtedly to the Maccabean period; Ps. lxxxiii is a reflection of 1 Maccabees v.

Isa. lxiii. 1-4 contains no reference to Edom. Read with Lag. Du. מִצְרַיִם, cf. Nahum ii. 4 instead of מִצְרַיִם, and מִצְרַיִם, cf. LXX instead of מִצְרַיִם.

¹ Diod. Sic. xix. 98, cf. Nöldeke, *Encyc. Bib.*, art. "Edom."

² 1 Macc. v. 65.

³ Eusebius, *Chron.*, cf. Schürer, *op. cit.*, III, p. 6.

⁴ Schürer, *op. cit.*, I, p. 730.

upon Jewish territory. To this time of Artaxerxes Ochus we may refer some of those utterances against Edom in which the Edomites are charged with malicious joy in the catastrophe which had befallen Judah; we may perhaps also assign Obad. vv. 1-14, and Lam. iv. 21 sqq. to this period. With the exception of the condemnation of Edom in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, which points to a different period of history in the life of Judah, most of the prophecies against Edom are found in very late literature. The time at which the Jews were harassed by the Edomites being, thus, the middle of the fourth century, the events referred to by Malachi (i. 4) cannot belong to this period, for we hear of no reverses borne by the Idumeans (for as such they were known since the fourth century) until we come to the Maccabean period, when Judas (165-161) defeated them¹. To this time the expression used in Mal. i. 4 may well apply, as the fortune of the Jews was then very varied and when, so far from being able to sustain their mastery over the Idumeans, they were themselves defeated by Lysias at Beth-Zacharyah². This defeat, and the subsequent fate of Judas, gave to the Idumeans an opportunity to "build up" again, and in the time of Jonathan, the successor of Judas, we hear nothing of them, for the internal complications in Judaea, and his constant warfare with the Syrian kings, left him no time to subjugate the Idumeans who, therefore, had again a breathing space. The growing power of the new Jewish state and the imperialistic policy of the successors of Judas would naturally lead any observant Jew to ask how long would his native land of southern Judaea remain in the hands of the impious Idumeans? In the success of the Maccabees such a question found its answer; the Idumeans might build, but Yahweh, through the instrumentality of the Maccabees would destroy. It is therefore to the time of Jonathan that this prophecy must be assigned, for

¹ 1 Macc. v. 3, 65. Read in 1 Macc. v. 3 ἐν Ἰδουμαίᾳ N. Old Lat.

² Schürer, op. cit., I, p. 213.

under John Hyrcanus (135-104) that catastrophe overtook the Idumeans¹.

We now return to the question who was the פחה of Mal. i. 8?

As we saw above, the term פחות was applied in Talmudic times to the displaced high-priests. Now in the year 153 B. C. Jonathan assumed the office of high-priest, being appointed by Alexander Balas². In the year 150 B. C., moreover, he was appointed στρατηγός and μεριδάρχης³. This was a mere form, as he was practically an independent ruler; but to both Balas and Jonathan it served a practical purpose. Apart from the dignity of high-priest we find Jonathan bearing two titles, στρατηγός = סֵן⁴, *prefect or military governor* and μεριδάρχης = *civil governor*, 1 Macc. x. 65, which exactly describes the office of Nehemiah, to whom the title פחה is given in the MT.⁵, which the LXX renders ἑπαρχος, so that his official titles were סֵן and פחה of Judah, thus uniting both offices in his own person.

The conditions of life, political and religious, which prevailed in Jerusalem in the earlier part of Jonathan's rule, give us the historical justification for the accusation brought against the priests in Mal. ii. 7 sqq.

Alkimus, the high-priest, was himself the leader of the Greek party in Jerusalem⁶, a fact which would naturally add to the influence of Greek thought in the expression of religious belief, and of Greek culture in the Temple worship. This was doubtless an offence in the eyes of the Jewish legalist and national party, and resulted in scorn of the priests who followed him as their head. They regarded the death of Alkimus as a divine punishment for his impiety, especially for his destruction of the temple-

¹ Jos., *Ant.*, xiii. 9. 1, *Bell. Iud.*, i. 2. 6, cf. *Ant.*, xv. 7. 9.

² 1 Macc. x. 15, 21, Jos., *Ant.*, xiii. 2. 1, Schürer, op. cit., I, p. 228.

³ 1 Macc. x. 51-66, Jos., *Ant.*, xiii. 4. 1, 2; Schürer, op. cit., I, p. 231.

⁴ Cf. Jer. lvii. 23, 57; Ezek. xxiii. 6, 12, 23, MT. and LXX.

⁵ Neh. v. 14, 18, xii. 26.

⁶ 1 Macc. ix. 54-6.

wall. This introduction of Greek philosophy and culture into the worship of Yahweh explains the phrase *יָבֹעַל בְּתִיָּאֵל נָכַר*, Mal. ii. 11, while the situation presented in ii. 10 is made clear by the fact that the two contending parties, the Greek-Jewish and the National-Jewish, were alike Jews, children of one God, although in vehement opposition. The writer of the Book of Malachi does not seek to widen the breach already existing, but rather to heal it by reminding the two parties of their common origin, while at the same time forcibly denouncing those who follow a corrupt worship, and who thereby desecrate the Temple; for at heart he is a Jew of the old type, at least so far as the cult is concerned, though all the time holding to a spiritual conception of Yahwism.

Where two religious parties contend together there is often a third, that of the honest free-thinker who, however, can exist only under some influence in itself ennobling, although, it may be, antagonistic to some form or expression of the faith in which he has been brought up, ii. 17 seq., iii. 13 sqq., such an influence as made itself felt pre-eminently in the Greek period, when a higher and more philosophical conception of God was disseminated among the learned Jews, and when the aesthetic idea gained hold of the educated classes. Both aspects of thought were new to Judaism, and served to prepare the Jews for ethical and aesthetical pleasure, mental and physical, such as did not enter into the severe view of life taken by the Mosaic law, and which introduced into their religion a deepened sense of spirituality. This enrichment of their soul-life demanded the struggle with which the butterfly breaks from the chrysalis. To the Jewish party they were renegades; even by a man of so lofty a type as our prophet they were misunderstood, in spite of his teaching that even the sacrifices of the heathen were acceptable to Yahweh, and indeed that sacrifice was a mere means to the attainment of a higher and more spiritual faith.

The writer of the Book of Malachi gives us—in theological

terms—a rapid summary of the great struggle between the National-Jewish party—which believed that the return to former glory could be achieved only by a more strict observance of Law and Custom and the exclusion of foreign elements—and the Graecised-Jewish party which desired the adoption of Greek thought and culture as a means of national advancement and prosperity, as well as of a life of wider activity, mental and spiritual. The writer himself belongs to neither party. Although his inclination toward a stricter Judaism is evident, he is personally free from an unspiritual ritualism and his teaching is, in a sense, a forecast of that later outlook which has brought its healing message of the sonship and brotherhood of man.

NOTE.—Since writing this article my attention has been drawn, by a reference in Marti's *Dodeka Propheton*, to Winkler's suggestion that the Book of Malachi belongs to the middle of the second century, to which Marti objects that Malachi must be earlier than 180, since his words (iii. 24) are quoted by Jesus Sirach, xlviii. 10. The passage beginning at ver. 22 is regarded as a later addition by Marti himself, as well as by others, and the parallelism may be otherwise accounted for, either (1) as a quotation by Malachi from Sirach or (2) by both from a common source. The passage in Sirach occurs in a chapter referring to the coming of Elijah, and ver. 10 is hence in its proper connexion, whereas, as occurring in Mal. iii. 24, obvious connexion is absolutely lacking.

HANS H. SPOER.